DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 511 SO 014 381

AUTHOR Kohlberg, Lawrence; And Others
TITLE The Just Community School: The Theory and the Cambridge Cluster School Experiment.
INSTITUTION Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. Graduate School of Education.
PUB DATE 10 Sep 75
NOTE 82p.; In: Collected Papers from the Center for Moral Education, 1975. Chapter 29, p1-77.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Schools; Curriculum Development; Educational Assessment; Educational Objectives; Educational Principles; *Ethical Instruction; Evaluation Methods; Group Dynamics; *Moral Development; *Moral Values; *Nontraditional Education; *Participative Decision Making; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS *Just Community Approach; Kohlberg (Lawrence)

ABSTRACT

The background, evaluation process, theories, and practical aspects of the Just Community High School in Cambridge, Masachusetts, are presented. The document is organized into four sections. Section 1 briefly discusses the components of a Just School: participatory democracy with teachers and students having equal rights, emphasis on conflict resolution through consideration of fairness and morality, and inclusion of developmental moral discussion in the curriculum. Section 2 proposes methods for a 3-year evaluation which would focus on the governance, structure, and curriculum of the school. Section 3, which comprises the major portion of the document, outlines 15 components of Just Community School theory, including justice as a means and end in moral education, as an individual moral stage, and as social atmosphere; justice and community as curriculum; direct and indirect conditions of moral growth; conditions for creating a good moral atmosphere; and group dynamic theory. Section 4 discusses structure and procedures to implement the theory. Topics include the Just Community School's relation to school administrators and to the total high school of which it is a part, the voluntary requirements of students and teachers, consultants' role, community meeting, advisor groups, and the discipline committee. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223511

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lawrence Kohlberg
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Just Community School: The Theory and the Cambridge Cluster School Experiment

Kohlberg, Wasserman and Richardson

September 10, 1975
Collected Papers

SP 014 381

CHAPTER 29: The Just Community School: The Theory and the Cambridge Cluster School Experiment

Kohlberg, Wasserman and Richardson

I. INITIATION OF A JUST COMMUNITY SCHOOL, 1974-1975

In June, 1974, Lawrence Kohlberg and the Harvard Center for Moral Education received from the Kennedy Foundation a two-year grant to establish a Just Community School within a public high school based on Kohlberg's theory of moral development. The Kennedy grant was to coordinate with a three-year Danforth Foundation grant jointly to Ralph Mosher (Professor of Counseling Education, Boston University) and to Kohlberg for curriculum development and teacher training in moral discussion in high school courses in social studies and in guidance and psychological education. The school systems of Cambridge and Brookline gave their approval to the Danforth project plan of conducting workshops for ten to fifteen high school teachers (social studies, counseling and English) in each city for training in conducting moral discussions.

The Kennedy Just School project portion of the general plan was to establish a small (60-70) ethnically and socio-economically diverse alternative public school within a public high school based on the Just Community approach to moral education. Table 1

presents a synopsis of the theory, elaborated in the appendix of this proposal. In planning, the theory provided the following central guidelines for the school:

1. The governance of the School should be one of participatory democracy with students and teachers having equal rights and a vote of one. This implied: (a) rules should not be provided in advance, but made through establishing a social contract between teachers and students, and (b) all major issues of school governance, rules and policy should be made in a (weekly) community or town meeting.
2. The governance structure and community meetings should stress solutions of issues through considerations of fairness and morality.
3. The curriculum or academic classes of the school (especially social studies) should involve developmental moral discussion and should stress basic understanding of concepts of democracy, law and justice. Classroom discussions of morality, law and democracy should be integrated with the real-life decisions and policies of the small school community meetings and with the school's relation to the larger school system and society.

TABLE 1

COMPONENTS OF A JUST COMMUNITY SCHOOL
(Justice Structure)

1) Theoretical orientation:	Cognitive-developmental psychology
2) Educational goals:	To develop moral reasoning by creating a school community that is perceived as fair and just by students and staff. To establish congruence between the overt and the hidden curriculum.
3) Specific educational outcomes:	Creating a Moral Community Establishing a community based on democracy and fairness Extending responsibility to the students Encouraging collective responsibility Creating a climate of trust Establishing a social contract and a constitution Raising the moral level of the group as a group Establishing staff authority through ability to mediate and resolve conflicts between students and students and students and staff in a fair manner Stimulating individual moral decisions and actions Sharing the principles and theory of the moral development approach with students
4) Organizational structure of the school	Students and staff draw up a constitution All members are governed by the constitution; each member has equal right to call meetings and to voice opinions; each member has one vote on decisions Small group sessions are held in which proposals for community decisions are drafted: Groups: Preparation group for community agendas Discipline committee Staff training group Advisor groups Democracy classes I and II Community meetings are held weekly during which the entire community processes proposals and makes decisions; enactment of a proposal depends on the majority vote

TABLE 1 (Continued)

5) Organization and evaluation of instruction	Conditions provided for moral change: Role-taking opportunities Intellectual stimulation Responsibility for decision-making given to students Creation of cognitive-moral conflict through discussion of moral and personal dilemmas Exposure to the next highest stage of moral reasoning Creation of conditions in which the student perceives his environment as fair and just A number of projects are currently underway to evaluate the objectives and processes of the Just Community School.
6) Home/school/ community involvement	The Just Community School is the result of the support of the Cambridge High School Committee which authorized a summer workshop composed of teachers, parents, students and resource persons that spelled out the school's enrollment, staffing, curriculum, governance and space needs, and its commitment to the justice structure.

Cambridge was chosen as the site to implement such a school not only because of its proximity to Harvard, but because Cambridge:

a) Has a very diverse high school population ethnically and socio-economically. It has a large proportion of "disadvantaged" adolescents, but also a minority of advantaged and academically gifted adolescents.

b) Has a record for stability and slow but progressive educational change so that a successful educational experiment could last in spite of changes in political and educational climate.

1. Starting the School

The opportunity to establish a Just Community Alternative School developed in July, 1974, through the spontaneous desire of a group of parents, teachers and students to establish a new alternative school within the Cambridge High and Latin School.[1] The School Committee approved a summer planning

[1] The impetus came from the fact that these parents and students had applied to an already existing alternative school within Rindge Technical High School of Cambridge and had been turned down because of oversubscription. A small group of faculty and doctoral students at the Harvard Graduate School of Education had organized the Cambridge Pilot School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1969, funded by a federal grant. The Cambridge School Department took over this school on termination of the grant and has continued to maintain it as an informal or open school in Cambridge. During the spring of 1974 the school was oversubscribed.

workshop composed of teachers, parents, students and resource persons. One resource person was Kohlberg, who had been invited to help by some of the parents and encouraged to accept the invitation by the Superintendent.

The workshop group ended the summer with guidelines that spelled out the enrollment, staffing, curriculum, governance and space needs of the program. The group had also committed itself to implementing Kohlberg's concept of the Just Community or Moral Development approach to the new school, termed the Cluster School.

In the early fall a workshop for the Cluster School teachers was held to plan the opening of the school and to review the theory of the Just Community. The role of Kohlberg was to be a consultant, meeting weekly with the teachers and attending community meetings. Three half-time graduate students assisted in this consulting-training role (Elsa Wasserman, M.A.; Nancy Richardson, M.A.; and Chris Mackin) and in maintaining a participant observer narrative of the school's development.

The focus of the Kennedy project, then, was a consultation system with staff which would implement the theory in the school. Consultants attend and participate in the weekly community meetings, classroom discussions, retreats and field trips. A weekly three-hour consultation meeting of the teachers and Kennedy staff focuses on:

a) Review of the preceding community meeting;

b) Analysis of the current functioning of the school from the point of view of the theory and suggestions of new mechanisms (rules, procedures, committees, courses);

c) Suggestions as to ways in which staff might improve skills in leading community meetings and small groups;

d) Planning the issues to be presented at the next community meeting and the manner of their presentation (in terms of the prior points).

As of June, 1975, a model of direct democracy had proved successful in making realistic rules, enforcing them through a student process, and establishing a sense of community and positive morale in a group of diverse students (academically gifted, learning disabilities, professional background, lower class, black-white). Teachers have come to understand the theory and to become committed to it. While much development of the school remains to be done, the school is positively viewed by teachers, students and the Headmaster and Superintendent of Schools.

2. Plans for 1975-1976

The Kennedy grant will support the consultation intervention in Cambridge through June 1, 1976. In addition, consultation will be extended to the School-Within-a-School in the Brookline High School. Through the Danforth project, some of the teachers at the school have been trained in moral development theory and discussion. The Brookline staff and students desire to implement the Just Community structure in 1975-1976 and the current Kennedy staff will supply consultation.

Of particular urgency is coordination of moral discussion with classroom curriculum in social studies and English-humanities. This involves preparation of social studies units on: (a) law and government in a free society coordinated with moral discussion, and (b) comparative communities (associations, institutions, religious and ethnic groups) coordinated with moral discussion. It also involves a coordinated English-humanities curriculum. At this point we believe the School has reached the stage of development at which a systematic research evaluation of its impact on student development can be begun.

II. PROPOSED RESEARCH EVALUATION OF THE CLUSTER SCHOOL

1. Major Objective

The major objective is to evaluate the three-year effects of: (a) the Just Community governance structure, and (b) the Just Community classroom curriculum (in English and social studies, stressing moral discussion) in the Cambridge Cluster School and the Brookline School-Within-a-School. The impact of the Just Community governance structure and curriculum will be evaluated in terms of the following:

a) Success in creating the conditions for moral (and intellectual) development;

b) Success in actually causing individual student moral (and intellectual) development over the three-year period.

a) Conditions for Growth

Following the theory (next section): (a) The conditions for moral development may be defined in terms of (1) direct conditions of moral development observable in community meetings, discipline committee meetings, and classroom discussions. These include amount and stage of (i) role taking, (ii) judgments of fairness, (iii) treating decisions as moral issues, (iv) presence of conflict (of two sides), and (v) participation in, and concern about community decisions. (b) Indirect conditions for moral

development are observable through the moral atmosphere interview. The moral atmosphere interview assesses students' attitudes (positive-negative) toward the school and conceptualizations or moral stage of perception of the school. Assessment of attitudes and perceptions are made in the areas of (i) school program, ideals, goals, (ii) rules and discipline, (iii) staff personality and relations to students, and (iv) peer-group personalities and relations. Attitudes are assessed as positive in terms of (i) school and peer group's perceived fairness, (ii) school and peer group's perceived sense of community, belongingness, sharing, and (iii) school and peer group's moral concern and responsibility.

Perceptions and conceptualizations of the school and group are (iv) rated as to moral stage. Perception of the community as at a relatively high stage (at the students' own highest stage or the next above) is conducive to moral growth.

b) Actual Student Growth

Individual students will be assessed in the fall of 1975, in the spring of 1976, in the spring of 1977 and the spring of 1978. This will yield data on amount of change or growth compared to control students not in the Cluster School or the School-Within-a-School but in comparable high schools (Cambridge High and Latin and Brookline High School). Assessments will include:

a) Stage of moral judgment or reasoning;

b) Piaget stage of cognition or logical reasoning;

c) Actual moral behavior;

d) Scholastic achievement;

e) Level of ego development or self-concept (Loevinger scale).

2. Design of the Study

A. Cluster School and School-Within-a-School Students

Fifteen students were assessed in March, 1975, on preliminary forms of the measure. Twenty additional students entering the Cluster School (ninth and tenth grades) and 20 students entering the School-Within-a-School in September, 1975, will be assessed at that time. Twenty additional students entering the Cluster School and 20 students entering the School-Within-a-School in September, 1976, will be assessed.

B. Comparison Students

Thirty-five "control" students from Cambridge High and Latin will be assessed in September, 1975. They will be matched as well as possible in I.Q., S.E.S., ethnicity and grade. Thirty additional controls will be assessed in September, 1976. A similar control group will be taken from the Brookline High School for the School-Within-a-School program.

C. Measures

a) Measures of conditions for moral growth include: (i) Direct conditions - assessment of transcripts of community meetings, discipline committee meetings, and classes on the discussions of conditions specified in "objectives, direct conditions" (Appendix B presents sample transcripts of meetings); and (ii) indirect conditions - assessment of moral atmosphere interviews on the Cluster School and School-Within-a-School students and the various control students, to be rated for the discussions described in "objectives, indirect conditions" (Appendix C presents samples of the moral atmosphere instrument).

[App. B & C?]

b) Measures of student growth: (i) Moral Judgment - a three-story standard interview assessing stage of moral reasoning. Alternate forms (A and B) will be used to control for rational effects (Appendix C presents samples of the measure); (ii) Logical Stage - the Colby-Kuhn standardized assessment of Piagetian formal operations will be administered; and (iii) Moral Behavior - the Feldman critical incident technique for assessing moral behavior will be used. This technique combines direct observations in halls and classrooms with interviews of students about their behavior and that of others. Self-report, reports by other students and direct observations are combined to achieve a valid record of "good" (pro-social) and "bad" (anti-social) behavior. "Bad" behavior involves: (1) violations of school

community rules; (2) violations of laws, justice and society welfare outside the school; (3) anti-social or aggressive acts against others. "Good" behavior involves (1) acts of purposive support of school or community rules; (2) acts actively supportive of justice and social welfare outside the school; and (3) altruistic pro-social or helping acts to other individuals.

III. THE THEORY OF THE JUST COMMUNITY SCHOOL

The theory of a Just Community school is not new but old; it is a modernized version of John Dewey's progressive, democratic, and developmental view of education. The goal of the school is progress or development, both cognitive and moral, for the individual student. A concern by the school for the progress of the individual and his sense of justice implies a concern (by the school and the student) for the progress of the society toward greater justice, and vice versa. The development of the child, his standard of progress, is something studied by the child psychologist, but the child's progress is related to the progress of the society. Ultimately, the standard for the development of the individual or the society is to a higher level of moral awareness and action. The fundamental way in which education aids social progress is through aiding the moral development of the individual and the society.

1. Justice as means and ends in moral education

We have said the aim of education is development and in this word "development" as an educational aim is a for a moral or just school. Ordinarily we think of justice and community as desirable qualities of a school, but not as defining the educational purpose of a school. The qualities of justice and community of the school we usually think of as humanitarian rather than as educational goals. We usually think of the justice of the school as like the happiness and enjoyment of the child, as something desirable but not really the purpose of the school and the various sense of "learning." American educational thought usually defines goals and then considers the most efficient means to those goals. Even when the child's moral development is taken as a goal, we tend to think of moral learning as a school's developing a "curriculum" which is an efficient means to such a goal. We must think not only about the school as an efficient means to moral development or "learning." We must also think of the morality of educational means. For instance, the instrumental use of reward for efficient learning may be efficient from some points of view, but it cannot be a means for moral development or moral education. Instrumental reward for learning is indifferent to criteria of fairness or justice. If we were to instrumentally reward for moral stage

development, that would be open to the same objections as moral behavior training. We must consider justice the means as well as the ends of education.

2. Justice as individual moral stage and as social atmosphere

In speaking of the moral educator and the moral growth of the child we are speaking only in individual terms. Moral learning is not like learning to read or write or spell. It is not a skill acquired by an individual for individualistic motives. Moral development is social through and through. To take moral development as an aim of education is to create a moral or just community. In this sense cognitive development and moral development are different. The cognitive development of a school is merely that of the sum of the individual students. In contrast, the moral development of a school is its working justice and the community as a social whole. In this sense, the aim of the school is social--the endpoint is not the individual child. Further, it is not only the justice and community of the small school but those of the larger community.

If we reject the opposition of means and ends in education, we must also reject the opposition of the good of the individual student and the social good as ultimate contradictions and dissolve distinctions between means and ends of developmental moral

education.and the good of the individual and of the school as a community. There can be little controversy about the following characteristics of a just school whether or not such a school is optimally efficient for moral development:

1. It has regard for the rights of each individual student and of each teacher. Such recognition of rights implies fundamental equality of rights of students and teachers and the equal worth of all.

2. The school is open to all, it is diverse by social class and race, it is not segregated or restricted to the few.

3. The process of decision making in the school considers the rights, voices and interests of all, i.e., the school is democratic.

Democracy, diversity, regard for rights--these are virtues of a school which is just. Justice and rights confront the school from the point of view of fairness to each individual.

Approached from the point of view of the social whole, the just school is a community. A community is a whole which is more than the sum of its individual parts. It implies shared goals, a common cause, and shared norms and social or shared sentiments. We call this the sense of community. Another word for it is "morale," or in old-fashioned language, "school spirit." Community, morale, "school spirit" is not always fully just, as "old boy" or "old school tie" school spirit

indicates. Any school with school s rit, however, is a community at some level of justice and community, if not a high level. To create a sense of community requires more than a concern form justice and a regard for the rights of the individual student, however. It requires also a common social goal. Here we enter the fundamental paradox of moral education. The means of education are social and moral, but its ends seem to be those of individual learning or moral development. A just community that is a real community must have some social work. This of course was the intent of Dewey's "project" method.

3. Justice and community as "curriculum": Dewey's concept of curriculum "projects" in the democratic school

Dewey believed that the curriculum should focus on small group research and work "projects" in a democratic school. The first "project" of the Just Community school is its own sheer creation and maintenance. This is why the formation of a school from nothing out of a social contract is such an exciting and community-building process.

To create a sense of community requires more than a concern for fairness. It requires a common social goal. Here we enter the fundamental paradox of moral education. The means of education are social and moral, but ends seem to be those of individual learning or development. A just school that is a real community must have some social work, a social goal which is not just that of the development of individual values. This was the intent of Dewey's "project" method.

Rightly concerned, rather than as small group busywork for young children, the "project" defines the learning activities of the just school. As noted, the first project of the just community school is its own sheer creation and maintenance. The formation of a school from nothing out of a social contract is an exciting and community-building process as well as a vehicle for individual learning about justice, democracy and government. To integrate disagreement, to come to share what was unshared, is an invigorating process. To face crises to school survival and to surmount them creates community. Other social projects involve less individual learning or development. Working together on a car wash to pay for a school retreat is a genuinely social project, even though it seems uneducational.

Even though it does not seem to be educationally valuable, to learn to work together for a common goal is a kind of moral learning as valuable to the individual and society as individual skill and value-learning. This is even more true of projects whose aim is the betterment of those outside the school.

Most social projects for children are treated individualistically by children because they are suggested or imposed by adults. A spontaneous group of elementary children would never think to collect for charity, though they might for their own group. The spirit of contribution to society from a group comes after it has developed a sense that is solidary or just enough as a community to expand its spirit outward with some missionary zeal, with the belief that the spirit of the group is a spirit others should share. To command the allegiance and sacrifice of the individual the group must first offer something to the individual. As a member of a group the individual benefits from achieving a common goal. In the theories of G. H. Mead, Piaget and H. S. Sullivan, the assumption is found that the elementary school child's morality develops in the social game. In the ideal team game, children make, agree on and enforce the rules; i.e., they become concerned with justice. In the ideal game they cooperate for a common goal; they make community. The juvenile game has its limits as an agency of

of moral growth. It has a collectively selfish end, its fairness is competitive, and it has an internal hierarchy in which rewards and power go to the ablest rather than being distributed in terms of fairness. Finally, its goal is physical and extra-curricular, it is not work nor is its goal moral or cognitive learning. The elementary school child is in some sense not ready for self-defined work or consciously self-directed learning.

The game group of the elementary school child is, then, not yet a moral group. Intenally, it is moral in commanding loyalty and demanding a degree of internal justice. Its relationship to those outside the group is not, however, moral. In a certain sense the just community school is a more serious, moral justice "game" for the adolescent development of concepts and commitments to social justice.

4. Why a democratic school requires the moral development theory: A history of other efforts at school democracy

We explained why a progressive theory of education for development requires a democratic or just school. Many schools, particularly "alternative" or "free" schools, have recognized the value of democracy without, however, seeing the need to relate democracy to a theory of moral development. We believe that the failure to link democracy to developmental theory is partly responsible for a history of failure or partial success in efforts to establish direct or participatory democracy.

Since the late 1960s, over 200 school systems across the country have set up public alternative schools and scores of other districts are planning them, both in the cities and the suburbs. "Their format may range from a street school to a learning center, to a school within a school, but their common thread is a commitment to voluntarism (a clientele participating through choice), to providing a different kind of education from the standard fare of the public school system, and to financial support from district funds." (NASP Special Report Series)

"Alternative schools are characterized by relatively informal, unregimented, non-authoritarian, person-to-person human relationships, by shared decision making, and by respect for and acceptance of a wide range of personal and cultural

backgrounds and value systems." (Riordan, 1972, p. 3) Partly because they tend to be smaller than conventional schools, alternative schools have fewer rules and bureaucratic constraints for students and teachers.

The preparation of students as active participants in a democratic society is seen as an important goal in most alternative schools. The Center for New Schools studied 15 schools and concluded that:

> Many of the schools believe that a basic goal of their work with students is to help them become active, independent, and responsible adults. Direct student participation in decision making is viewed as the most effective means of achieving this goal. All of the schools experienced significant difficulties in increasing cooperative participation in school decision making. Most schools have tried several approaches and are still modifying their forms and procedures for governance. (Center for New Schools, 1974, p. 13)

Democratizing their governing and policy making to involve both students and staff was a central concern. "The forum for this democratic process was a whole community meeting or whole staff meeting, in which the attempt was made to decide all important policy questions." Many difficulties, however, have been encountered in making democracy viable. "The first [is] the extreme difficulty of making policy in a large meeting. The second [is] the limited interest many students [have] in becoming involved in decision making once the petty rules of the traditional school (e.g., dress code, hall passes, etc.)

[have] been eliminated." (Center for New Schools, 1972, p. 11) As attendance fell off at the community meetings and the need for making decisions became more acute, the schools either created small but representative decision-making groups, or the staff regained the decision-making power with few students participating. "However, such groups have still experienced formidable problems in making clear decisions and carrying them out." (Center for New Schools, 1974, p. 13)

A case study of student involvement in decision making at Chicago's Metro High School further illustrates the issues raised when schools attempt to involve students in the decision-making process. Metro is an urban alternative high school with a student enrollment of 350. Students are selected from a stratified lottery of volunteers to ensure equal distribution from the population of the city, taking into consideration race, age, sex, and socio-economic class. A primary goal of the school is student involvement in decision making and governance. The Metro planners felt that students would be quick to grab the reins of power and create a governance structure that would enable them to run the school with staff support according to their ideas of what makes a "good" school.

Students initially felt there was no need for a school government, but that if some form were necessary, it should be based on direct representation. An all-school meeting was to

function as the major decision-making body within the school. "Although it was effective in a few crisis situations, the meeting proved unwieldy for making ordinary decisions. Attendance fell off by the middle of the first semester, and, in the absence of clear-cut decisions by these meetings, staff meetings and staff committees became the main arena for decision making." (Center for New Schools, 1972, p. 316) Several staff members then encouraged students to form a representative governing body, which met only once.

Students were mainly concerned with handling their own personal daily concerns as they involved the school, and in knowing they could complain to the staff about activities they disliked. The students were willing to let the staff solve the problems. Since the students felt that their major objectives had been largely achieved, they saw little reason to become involved in a formal decision-making process. The "do your own thing" and "hang loose" ethic reinforced students' views of people "just getting alone" and "getting it together" as a legitimate way to deal with the operation of the school.

> As Metro High School's attempt to involve students in decision making indicates, alternative schools have encountered a number of severe difficulties in efforts to realize such goals through specific, commonly employed practices. It would be premature to present any general theory about the nature of these difficulties--instead we hope to suggest ways that such analysis might proceed. However, there is one prevailing idea to which many of the problems of alternative schools can be traced--the concept of

> "organic growth". . . . The concept of "organic" or "natural" growth suggests that once people are freed from the oppressive restrictions of the traditional school, a new learning community will evolve naturally as people deal with each other openly and honestly.[1] (Center for New Schools, 1972, p. 336)

Our theory suggested reasons why we might succeed where others failed. First, we felt participatory democracy had failed because it was not a central commitment of a school; rather, it was a humanitarian frill. Democracy as moral education provides that commitment. Second, democracy in alternative schools often failed because it bored the students. Students preferred to let teachers make decisions about staff, courses, schedules, than to attend lengthy complicated meetings. Our theory said that the issues a democracy should focus on were issues of morality and fairness. Real issues concerning drugs, stealing, causing distrubances, grading, are never boring if handled as issues of fairness. Such moral issues are often evaded in alternative schools because of the pervasive "do your thing" ideology. Third, our theory suggested that if democratic decision meetings were preceded by small-group moral discussion, higher stage thinking by students would win out in town-meeting decisions, avoiding the disasters of mob rule.

---

[1] The organic notion parallels the maturationist stream of thought which holds that what is most important in the development of the child is that which comes from within him, and that the pedagogical environment should create a permissive climate to allow inner "goods" (abilities and social virtues) to unfold. Summerhill represents an example of a school based on these principles. In contrast, we hold that moral development takes place as a result of the child's interaction with a developing society or environment.

5. Moral discussion in a democratic school as a vehicle for development

In the previous section we gave some reasons our moral development theory suggested for the failures of democratic schools to work as viable democracies. We need now to indicate positively how: (1) a focus or awareness of school issues as moral issues, and (2) an awareness of stages of reasoning about these moral issues can aid the educator to create a democratic and positive learning environment. Many of the problems facing teachers are moral dilemmas or decisions. Moral decisions are decisions involving considerations of the rights of other people and of obligations to them. A central consideration in making a moral decision is fairness. A fair or just decision is one which gives each person his or her due through impartial assessment of the rights of all. The decision-making process can go on at various levels or moral stages. In order to clarify this point, we will give an example of how a perennial type of student-teacher conflict involves moral decisions made by the different individuals involved in a situation and how this conflict can be resolved through a process of moral discussion.

Like most high school teachers, Carol Owens is actively concerned about her students. She has developed a close relationship to Ina Martin, a student and advisee. Ina has confided to her teacher, Carol, that she smokes pot regularly in school,

trades it, and sees nothing wrong with it. The school principal, Mr. Turner, sees Ina dealing pot outside his window on day, and accuses Ina. Ina denies it. Mr. Turner calls Carol Owens, her advisor, and asks if she knows anything about Ina's use and trading of marijuana.

This is a typical conflict faced by a teacher. It is a moral conflict or a moral dilemma in which the teacher must decide which action is right. Is it right to report Ina? Ina had trusted Carol and confessed to her, counting on Carol to maintain that trust. On the other hand, Carol felt she had an obligation to the principal, to the rules of the school, to state law, and to herself to tell the truth. What is the morally right thing to do?

In this case, Carol reported Ina. Ina became angry and bitter at Carol. Fundamentally, the conflict between Carol and Ina is a moral conflict, a disagreement about what is right based on their misunderstanding of the other's moral reasoning. Whenever there are conflicts between people and their claims, such conflicts are best resolved by a process of moral discussion and reasoning. This process can go on at various levels which we call moral stages.

For instance, Ina sees Carol as having an obligation to keep a trust, she does not see that Carol has an obligation to maintain the institution's rules impartially. Ina is Stage 3,

she thinks that morality means being nice to other people and keeping good relationships with them. She does not understand obligations to the society and the maintenance of its rules.

Carol is Stage 4, she understands the importance of good personal relations but also considers her obligations to society and puts them ahead of personal feelings. Carol's decision is at a higher or more mature level of moral reasoning. Ina, because she is not at that level, does not understand Carol's decision, and thinks it is wrong and unfair. On the other hand, Carol does not understand why Ina does not think she is right and does not know how to communicate her thinking to someone at a different level. Even Carol's thinking has its limits in failing to recognize that students have rights, even when they violate the rules of the institution (an awareness worked out at Stage 5).

It would be useful to resolve this conflict by moral discussion within a small group of other students and staff. Group members could then help Ina and Carol understand each other's thinking by presenting that thinking in their own terms. The matter thus could become an issue for discussion and clarification of what is the fairest solution to the problem, rather than remaining a source of hostility. By coming to see each other's points of view, the misunderstanding could be at least partly

resolved. Besides helping resolve the conflict, such discussions can be a form of education, since they can help students to engage in new ways of moral thinking and to move to the next stage of moral reasoning, and can help teachers develop toward a morally higher level of response to students.

6. The need for the democratic community for resolving justice issues

In the last section we indicated how stage awareness and moral discussion could aid the teacher toward the positive resolution of teacher-pupil conflicts. Ultimately, however, the teacher's ability to resolve the conflict fairly and positively are limited as long as she must act alone in a relationship of teacher to pupil. No matter how "democratic" and fair and individual teacher tries to be, he will not be able to fully and fairly resolve teacher-student conflicts unless both the teacher and students are members of a larger just community which resolves issues democratically in a community meeting. We may illustrate this point by a further analysis of the Carol-Ina marijuana conflict. The conflict exists not only because Carol and Ina are at different stages of moral reasoning. The fact that Carol is caught in a conflict between an educational and an authority role is also a significant factor. In most schools, the teacher must oscillate between being a

"friend" and maintaining control. Students who see the teacher as a friend feel betrayed when issues of control come up; students who see the teacher as an authority interpret understanding and kindness as occasions of, and for, manipulation.

The conflict between Ina and Carol is an issue of control. But it can also be an issue of education if it is seen as a moral question. Many of the problems surrounding control must be faced and discussed frankly as moral problems by teachers and students as part of education rather than as issues to be avoided. For effective moral education, however, something more than discussion of moral conflicts between teachers and students and students and students must be set in motion. Ina might understand Carol better and change her thinking somewhat through improved communication, but the next time she violated a rule she would, no doubt, keep quiet about it.

Her whole approach to rules could change, howeve, if the issue came up in a small school in which discussions about marijuana and other rules that govern them were held among students and teacher together as a community. In such a situation, the group would have agreed in advance that when a student confides a violation of the rules to a teacher, the student must bring the confidence back to the group. Undoubtably, Martin would resist this, but she would have heard the discussion of the rights and wrongs of bringing a confidence to the group, and with further group discussion would realize that her disappointed expectations were not completely fair. The responsibility

of the group to the law and the need of the group to maintain the trust and confidence of the administration that it could handle its own drug issues would be brought out. If the community resolved that Ina had violated its marijuana rules, a discipline would be given to Ina by a student discipline committee.

By sharing authority with the group and making the group responsible, the Carol-Ina conflict is no longer the old conflict between teacher and student. It is now a conflict between Ina and the group of which Ina is a part. Because Ina feels a part of the group, she will feel an obligation to live up to its standards and think about its welfare. She may decide in the future not to violate the marijuana rules or other rules important for the group.

The moral development approach, then, implies establishing a democratic community in which rules and decisions are made by students and teachers together, each with a vote of one and in which students in small houses or clusters (of 40-80) have a responsibility for upholding the rules and settling conflicts in a fair and democratic way. In a democratic or just community, even though teachers relinquish authority, they can, in the long run, have much greater constructive influence on the students' moral decisions.

Only in a democratic setting can students have a full sense of living in a community which is fair. To be motivated to act fairly, students must feel they are part of a just community. Students will accept the standards and authority of a community if these standards can be understood as fair from their point of view.

So far we have explained: (1) Why moral development should be a central aim of the school; (2) why it requires a democratic or just community school; and (3) why a focus on or awareness of moral development contributes to a positive resolution of student-teacher conflicts and to a viable school democracy.

We need now to elaborate our theory of the conditions for moral growth as they have guided us in outlining the structure and functions of the various components of the Just Community school. The staff, the consultant and to some extent the students should keep these aspects of the theory in mind in leading small group discussions, in community meetings, and discipline committee meetings. Awareness of these conditions is necessary because they define the conditions for stimulating moral growth, which teachers can help provide in these meetings.

7. Direct conditions of moral growth

The conditions for moral growth stipulated by the theory can be divided into two parts:

Chapter 29 - 30

A. Direct: Conditions of group discussion and interaction in meetings.

B. Indirect: Conditions of the general moral atmosphere of the school.

Directly, small group meetings, discipline committee meetings and community meetings provide opportunities to listen to and express moral reasoning and decision making. These opportunities stimulate students to more mature moral thinking and decisions. The direct conditions of moral growth, then, are observable in community meetings, small group and advisory discussions, and discipline committee meetings.[1]

The theory includes the following assumptions about direct conditions for moral development:

1. Role-taking stimulates moral development - The leader should get students to explicitly consider the feelings and points of view of the other students discussing the dilemma and of the staff, the administration or community figures. This may extend to act-al role-playing of reactions in another's place.
2. Considering fairness stimulates moral development - The leader should raise issues as issues of fairness in student discussions of a dilemma or in community meetings.

---

[1] A staff member can listen to a tape of the meeting and determine: (a) Whether his participation to the meeting was aimed to provide these conditions of growth; and (b) whether the meeting was successful in that these conditions of growth occurred.

3. Treating decisions as moral (moral includes but is more extensive than fairness) stimulates moral development. "Moral" is distinct from the pragmatic, the legal, the procedural. The leader should focus the group on the moral issues in the decision.
4. Exposure to cognitive-moral conflict stimulates moral development - The leader should raise issues of moral difficulty and uncertainty and encourage thinking on both sides of an issue.
5. Exposure to the next higher stage of moral reasoning and role taking should stimulate moral development - The leader should pin-point or encourage higher stage reasoning or supply it himself.
6. Active participation in, and concern about group decision making about moral decisions stimulates moral development - The leader should show concern, and expect students to show concern, that all students have: (a) A sense of community; (b) concern for rules; and (c) an active voice in the community.

7. Indirect conditions for moral growth - moral atmosphere

The indirect conditions of growth are represented by the school's moral atmosphere. They refer to the students' general perception of the school rules and discipline structure,

of the staff, and of the peer group as these relate to the students' own moral perceptions, i.e., to his perception of the school's fairness, sense of community, and its other moral properties. A positive moral atmosphere stimulates moral development for the following reasons:

1. Democracy - Rules and decisions for which the students feel responsible (which they have made) stimulates development of mature moral orientations.
2. Fairness - Perceiving rules and decisions as fairly made leads to an enhanced valuing of and understanding of fairness as a basis of decision making.
3. Sense of community - Perceiving group concern for the individual and the individual for the group (sense of community) creates a positive moral atmosphere which stimulates growth.

Moral atmosphere is not usually directly observable in terms of interactions in community meetings, though it can be sensed or inferred from them. Objective assessment of "goodness" of moral atmosphere is based on the moral atmosphere interview. The moral atmosphere can be perceived as fair-unfair, communitarian-individualistic, etc.

Our theory of a good moral atmosphere is close to common sense. Common sense tells us that everyone wants: (a) To belong to a community or group which he likes, is proud of, and

which he cares about and which cares about him; and (b) to live in a community which is fair to both himself and others and in which he is fair to others.

Our theory elaborates common sense by saying that fairness and community have a stage or qualitative, as well as quantitative component. We find, for instance, that sometimes delinquent gangs are perceived as being "communities" and being "fair" by gang members, but they are perceived as being Stage 2 communities with Stage 2 features of justice as instrumental exchange. If a delinquent group is solidary or cohesive, it will not rat. If the group is thought of as fair, not ratting will be seen as a fair rule, fairly enforced. The fairness and cohesiveness of the delinquent group, however, may be perceived in Stage 2 terms, i.e., "They don't rat on me because they don't want me to rat on them." Participating in a group that is cohesive and fair at the Stage 2 level would not, we believe, lead to moral progress for a Stage 2 member in the way belonging to a Stage 3 group perceived as cohesive and fair would. Living in a Stage 3 group or moral atmosphere creates growth for a Stage 2 member because: (a) He is exposed to values, norms, and reasons at the next stage up; and (b) these norms and reasons are attractive, not only because they are the next stage up, but because they represent an attractive group with which the individual is identified.

Chapter 29 - 34

So far we have explained the importance of a just and communitarian moral atmosphere in terms of:

a) Common sense - Like begets like, fairness and concern by a community begets fairness and concern in the student.

b) Cognitive-developmental theory - Presenting the next stage up and making it attractive.

c) Group attraction or cohesion "identification" theory - Making a group which is cohesive or has a sense of morale, community, belonging.

Cognitive-developmental theory goes beyond the common sense notion that "like begets like" by recognizing that many a delinquent is treated fairly and warmly by staff or peers without becoming more fair or moral. Moral growth requires challenge or "cognitive conflict," not just comfort. However, cognitive conflict and exposure to norms and reasoning one stage higher is also not enough to make the next higher stage compelling. Group cohesiveness theory speaks to this. We need not only a fair, cohesive one-stage-up moral atmosphere or group, but a <u>new kind of group</u> for the adolescent, one that is a morally concerned, inclusive peer-group. Common sense tells us that the most critical aspect of the adolescent's life and sense of self is his relations to his peers. In most American high schools, peer groups have no moral responsibilities or commitments. Not only do they not particularly help support the formal objectives of

school learning and rules, but they do not morally support and take responsibility for their own members' welfare. They are often cliquey and competitive; members are dropped or added according to status needs. A clique drops a member if he lowers the prestige of the group or if he deviates from status mores rather than helps him. A clique refuses admission to a student if he has "wrong" but morally irrelevant attitudes, if he is "stupid," awkward, or "from the wrong side of the tracks."

A good moral atmosphere requires establishing: (a) A peer group community that has explicit moral concerns, tasks, responsibilities and authority and which is responsible for its members' welfare; (b) which expects its members to be responsible for both its welfare and for other moral goals; and (c) which is inclusive, not exclusive, not a clique, a group which is concerned with accepting as members individuals who are diverse ethnically, academically, and in life style.

In summary, a morally concerned, inclusive peer group should have the following properties of moral community: (a) The peer group is perceived as having moral rules and expectations; (b) these peer norms and their peer enforcement are perceived as fair; (c) the peer group is perceived as having legitimate authority to maintain these norms; and (c) the group is perceived as being morally concerned for each community member and members are seen as being concerned for the group and its goals.

When these conditions are met, members: (a) Will accept the existence and content of group norms which limit freedom or impulses for the welfare of others; (b) will tend to move toward the next stage higher if the moral atmosphere is of a higher stage; and (c) may attain a new level of moral commitment and concern, i.e., of commitment to acting out their highest level of judgment.

8. Creating the conditions for a good moral atmosphere

1. The first set of conditions for establishing a moral atmosphere stimulating moral growth is direct democracy itself. Social contract democracy is a condition for the following reasons: (a) It leads to perceived fairness of atmosphere--to a perception of rules, decisions, and roles of moral atmosphere as fair. (b) It leads to perceived community or cohesiveness of atmosphere, it creates a sense of community of a cohesive group. If the community must make collective decisions it must become a community, a group which works together and has common values and understandings; it leads the group to make moral demands or demand moral responsibility from its members through making and enforcing rules. (c) It leads the group to be morally responsible to members by appeals of the unfairly treated individual to the group that it be fair. (d) It leads the peer group to identify its welfare with that of the school.

2. The second set of conditions for a good moral atmosphere are those already listed as the direct conditions of growth from group interaction, i.e., interactions and decisions based on fairness, role taking, reasoning, and social participation at a relatively high stage.

3. A third set of conditions is ideology, i.e., explicit statement (by staff, etc.) of the need for and existence of a moral group. This includes: (a) Stating that the group is, or should be concerned about the welfare of each member, about justice; (b) stating that an individual is, or should be concerned about the welfare of the group (both of these statements imply "rewarding" or recognizing individual concern for, or performance for the group); and (c) staff demonstrating these concerns themselves through action or modeling.

9. Assessing moral atmosphere through atmosphere interviews

Good moral atmospheres have the following characteristics:

1. Level - The atmosphere is perceived as high-stage, relative to the individual perceiver's level.
2. The atmosphere is perceived as quantitatively fair, i.e., (a) the staff, the rules and peers are perceived as fair and (b) the self is perceived as acting fairly, or there is some pressure to act fairly.
3. Staff and peer behavior is perceived as relatively conforming to public rules or norms (peer norms, staff

norms, chosen rules).

4. Peer and staff norms are compatible or shared.
5. There is a sense of "we" feeling, of sharing norms or group cohesion. This includes (a) pride in or importance in group membership, (b) concern of self for others qua community members and perceived concern of others for self, and (c) self's and others' perceived concern for group goals or welfare, and (d) perceived responsibility of self's and others' for making and maintaining rules.

10. Group dynamic theories of social climate and its implications for the moral atmosphere of the Just Community School

Our theory of social atmosphere draws on three theories of small or face-to-face groups. The first theory is that of Lewin and "group dynamics." The second is that of Durkheim as applied in Soviet and Israeli collective education. Durkheim's theory accepts or includes all the propositions of group dynamics but, in addition, adds propositions relating to morality. The third (interactionist-developmental) theory is that of John Dewey, G. H. Mead, and Piaget. Our theory accepts most of the group dynamics and Durkheim propositions but adds developmental hypotheses to them.

In the United States, there have been two basic major approaches to small groups. One, the "sociological" or small social system approach (Homans, Bates, Semminel) is concerned with naturalistic observations of the forms and functions of small groups' interactions as prototypes of social systems in general.

The second, "social psychological" approach is often called group dynamics. This approach starts with the small group as a unique primary group, a unique agency of the formation of the self and of socialization. Central to this approach has been the cognitive-gestalt tradition of Kurt Lewin and the Michigan school. Lewin and his followers focused upon three phenomena:

1. The conditions of group cohesion or solidarity, morale and "we-feeling."
2. The norm-forming tendency of the group (and its relation to the degree of group cohesion).
3. The conditions under which group norms can be changed.

Starting with this last concern, Lewin conducted a series of experiments (e.g., in changing food habits and norms) which supported the following propositions about value or norm change through group processes:

1. One (a leader or "expert") can cause change more effectively through group discussion with group decision than through lecturing to a group or speaking to an individual (Lewin, 1947).
2. A "democratic" leader encouraging parliamentary discussion can produce more change than a directive-authoritarian leader (Preston and Heintz, 1949; Bovard, 1951).
3. The sequence of value teaching through group process involves (a) change in the group norm, (b) acceptance of the group norm by the individual, (c) commitment to the group norm outside the group situation.

According to Lewin (1951), social influence will not cause change in individual's norms, however, if group memberships are incompatible with change. In group decisions subject to social influence, the group can change its mind without threatening the individual's membership if he changes his values. Once a new group norm is set, it is maintained by group pressure to conformity. Decisions made in a group are public commitments to action, so there is a disposition to maintain or follow through on such public commitments.

4. Change through the group requires neutralizing counter-pressures. Lewin (1951) proposed a "cultural island," i.e., remote physical retreats where the individual was withdrawn from his usual social surroundings while a subculture or group was created to change standards. Such isolation enchances group cohesion. (Of course, such a "cultural island" situation of change is prone to "regression" on return home.)
5. Value change depends upon:
    a) The degree of consensus reached on a norm or decision, i.e., number agreeing (Bennett, 1952).
    b) The extent to which attitudes on the issue are public in the group, i.e., attitudes on the norm or issue are not concealed.
6. Influence toward value change must be non-coercive or voluntary. Ge 's neo-Lewinian theory of cognitive dissonance suggests that when there is overt behavior change toward conformity to a social force, there will be attitude change toward valuing the conforming act, if "pressure" toward conformity is non-coercive and non-extrinsic. If pressure for conformity is based on high extrinsic threat or reward, there will be external compliance but no genuine attitude change.

Chapter 29 - 42

11. Group cohesion

In group dynamics theory, the central characteristic for normative influence by the group on the individual is the cohesiveness of the group. By cohesiveness is meant the "groupness" of the group, especially:

1. The attractiveness of the group as a whole to its members (their desire to belong to the group) and the attractiveness (sociometric) of each of the other group members to each member (compared to outside friends, etc.).
2. The sense of "we-ness" or community and common fate of the group members.
3. The sense of loyalty or obligation to the group.

The following factors have been found to increase group cohesion:

1. Amount of interaction among group members.
2. The attractiveness of other members of the group.
3. The attractiveness of the activities of the group.
4. The power and status possessed by the group qua group relative to other groups or authorities.
5. The size of the group (i.e., the larger, over a limit, the less).
6. The voluntariness of initial membership in the group.

7. The demand that some "work" or service commitment or contract be made to enter or maintain membership in the group.
8. The existence of the possibility of leaving the group, not completely of free will but because of group rejection.
9. The existence of cooperative group goals. A cooperative goal situation is one in which an individual can attain his individual goal only if some or all the other members of the group achieve their goals, e.g., reward to the member (his goal attainment) comes only if all members of the group receive like reward (group rewards and punishments) or if there is a group goal or reward for the group as a whole which is not a reward to each member. Cooperation can be encouraged by:
    a) Making rewards or goals collective or distributed to the whole group.
    b) Stressing that the purpose of the group is to "help each other better," that the goal can only be reached through helping others in the group.
    c) Encouraging collective goals and activities of all sorts.
10. A group with democratic leadership will be more cohesive (Lippett and White, 1943; White and Lippett, 1953).

As compared to authoritarian or laissez faire leaders, democratic leaders produced group reactions of greater "we-feeling" (use of "we" versus "I", collective action) greater friendly remarks, more mutual reward or praise, more sharing of individual property, less aggressive remarks, and more group goal orientation.

12. Durkheim and collective education: The school group as moral (?)

For the moment, we will ignore the difference between the notion that morality develops through the peer group experiences and the notion that morality is formed, or internalized, through group experience, as elaborated by Durkheim (19) and applied in Soviet and Israeli collective moral education.

As opposed to Lewin's (group dynamics) concerns about all sorts of norms (e.g., food preference), Durkheim (collective education) stresses moral norms. He emphasizes that moral norms differ in nature or form from non-moral norms.

According to Durkheim, the content of moral norms varies from one society to another, but the Kantian formal attitude of morality is always the same (see Chapter). This attitude involves respect for rules, the sense that moral rules are fixed, regular and categorical and hold regardless of inclination (the feeling of duty). The feeling of respect or duty toward rules arises, says Durkheim, because we perceive them as arising not

from our own mind but from collective authority. Authority is "outside," "objective," but it is also "inside," shared by members of the group.

In addition to respect for rules (the spirit of discipline), the second element of morality is altruism, an "impersonal or unselfish end." Altruism, argues Durkheim, like duty, also comes from a sense of the group. "If our own personal interests are not altruisitic, neither can the interest of another single individual be. Yet [altruism] must be devotion to another conscious being [not to an abstract idea]. Altruism must be [oriented to] something superior [but conscious], the social group. It implies devotion to, or attachment to the group of which the individual is a member."

Associated with the notion that morality is respect for group authority and attachment to the group is Durkheim's belief that the youth group or school is an intermediary between the child and the state. The giver of rules (the ultimate authority) and the object of moral devotion is society (and its representative the state). The school is the intermediary between the child and society in this view, i.e., the school is to represent society to the child.

Intermediaries are necessary (between the child in the family and the society); the school environment the most desirable. It is more extensive than the family or the group of friends. It

results neither from blood nor free choice but from a meeting among subjects of similar age and condition. In that sense, it resembles political society. On the other hand, it is limited enough so that personal relations can crystallize. It is groups of young persons more or less like those of the social system of the school which have enabled the formation of societies larger than the family. Even in simple societies without schools, the elders would assemble the group at a given age and initiate them collectively into the moral and intellectual patrimony of the group.

In order to commit ourselves to collective ends, we must have above all a feeling and affection for the collectivity. We have seen that such feelings cannot arise in the family where solidarity is based on blood and intimate relationships since the bonds uniting the citizens of a country have nothing to do with such relationships. The only way to instill the inclination to collective life is to get hold of the child when he leaves his family and enters school and to instill in the child a feeling for collective ends.

13. Durkheim: Group rule making and discipline

Given this notion of moral formation, Durkheim proposes a number of guides to the teacher. The first set involves respect for rules. His concept of discipline implies a great deal of

rule keeping by the teacher as a representative of the group. He suggests the use of punishment, not for deterrence or retribution, but to symbolize the teacher and classes' disapproval of rule violation based on their respect for the rule.

The major things to keep in mind about disciplining from Durkheim's viewpoint are:

a) Discipline aids rule maintenance not through hedonistic "reinforcement" but through reviving respect for the rules and the group which makes them.

b) The discipliner, teacher or discipline board is seen as a legitimate representative of the group or school, not as an individual, arbitrary personality.

In terms of methods of discipline, says Durkheim, "the best punishment is that which [establishes] blame in the most expressive and least . . . painful way possible. Its purpose is to reaffirm the obligation [to the rule, to reaffirm it] when it is violated both to the culprit and to the other group members whose respect for the rule is demoralized by the offense. The discipline should have some meaning in teaching the positive meaning of the duty violated."

The second set of Durkheim's recommendations involve promoting "altruism," i.e., <u>increasing group cohesion</u> as discussed by group dynamics theorists. One of Durkheim's methods for increasing group cohesion involves the <u>cooperation variable</u>

discussed earlier in terms of Lewin's theory. According to Deutsch, a Lewin followers, the structuring of goals or rewards as interdependent promotes cohesion. Durkheim discusses interdependency in reward attainment in terms of collective reward and punishment:

> A means to awaken the feeling of solidarity is the discreet and deliberate use of collective punishments and rewards. Collective sanctions play a very important part in the life of the classroom. The most powerful means to instill in children the feeling of solidarity are to feel that the value of each is a function of the worth of all.

Durkheim does not generally advocate collective punishment (punishing the group for an individual moral violation). He does advocate collective reward (rewarding the group for a run of general good behavior). He says, "the important thing is for the child to realize he is working for everybody and everybody is working for him. Collective reward (or deprivation of reward) provides a solution to unconfessed violations which are treated as a general sign that the group is not doing well." It should be noted that all of Durkheim's recommendations are based on the assumption that there is some group cohesion and group authority and some recognition of the teacher as a representative of the group's authority and goals. If the teacher does not have this authority but is a prison guard, Durkheim's recommendations will simply lead to perception of the teacher as a Captain Queeg, a petty "Stage 4" tyrant.

Chapter 29 - 49

14. Symbolic interactional theory

We have so far discussed two theories contributing to "just community" theory--group dynamics (Lewin, et al) and collective education (Durkheim, the Marxists). A third major approach to sociological group theory is the American sociological counterpart of the cognitive-developmental individual psychology of Dewey, Mead and J. M. Baldwin. This is "symbolic interactionism" or Chicago sociology, the approach to groups and collectives which has developed from the theories of John Dewey, G. H. Mead and Charles Cooley. Central to this theory is, first, the notion that motives and values are cognitive "definitions of the situation" developing out of social communication, or interactive role taking through significant symbols. Second is the notion that motives and values are defined by a social self, by a dialogue between an "I" and a "me" or a "looking-glass self." The "me" is the self as object or role perceived through the eyes of a "generalized other." Self-definition and selection of a "reference group" or group perspective on the self as "me" is a dialectical or reciprocal process. I am who I am because I see myself through the eyes of certain "significant others" or groups; I choose to belong to certain groups and to have relations with certain "significant others" because my "me," my self-concept, can attain meaning and significance as a member of that group or through that group's frame of reference.

Chapter 29 - 50

This symbolic interactional theory of development of the social and moral self through role taking is elaborated in Chapter 5 of this volume (on the theory of moralization, Lickona). It has been used in discussing the direct conditions of moral growth in classroom discussions and community meetings. Here we need to explicate it in relation to indirect conditions or moral atmosphere. (We will not recapitulate why the sumbols interactionist or Dewey-Mead theory prescribes democracy as a condition for role taking.)

We have pointed out that Durkheim's moral theory of the group accepts most of the propositions of group dynamics but adds others addressed specifically to "moral" attitudes and norms. It may also be said that the cognitive-developmental or symbolic interactional theory accepts most of the Durkheim (and hence also the Lewin) propositions, but adds others specifically relevant to stages and to justice structures of group moral atmosphere. In addition, the theory clarified "why be democratic" in a much more convincing way than Lewin's theory does.

Starting with the latter point, we found in Lewin and Durkheim certain reasons to believe that a relatively democratic group would have greater group cohesion, make more joint group decisions and hence lead to more "internalization" of new moral norms. In these terms, group theory (Lewin, Durkheim) and

cognitive-developmental theory (Dewey, Mead, Piaget, Kohlberg) converge in suggesting common conditions for attainment of conventional morality in a community school. In Chapter we discussed our research on kibbutz collective moral education and concluded it was an excellent standard for movement from preconventional to conventional morality in "disadvantaged" urban Israeli adolescents.

The structural arrangements of the Cluster School (as defined in the forthcoming section) are at present primarily designed to stimulate and consolidate "conventional" morality in the students. The "average" entering student is either Stage 2 or Stage 3 and progress requires movement to Stage 3 or Stage 4. It will be recalled (Chapter 5) that individual moral stage (e.g., Stage 3) may be of a pragmatic-rules substage (3A) or a fairness-ideal substage (3B). At Stage 3A, "the rules are the rules" and should be maintained rigidly.for group order and survival. At 3B the rules are the expressions of group concern and fairness; their legitimacy is based on "being democratic and fair" and their application to a case is based on this construction. At Stages 3A or 4A, group authority and welfare is non-reciprocal; at Stages 2, 3B and 4B, the individual's respect for the group implies reciprocal respect of the group for the individual.

Our group theory, then, "democratizes" the Lewin-Durkheim theory in stressing:

a) Eventual movement beyond conventional morality, and

b) Movement from more conventional (3A, 4A) to more democratic and fair (3B, 4B) orientations within conventional morality.

The theory implies that many Lewin-Durkheim prescriptions for staff leadership will only be appropriate at certain stages or phases in the development of the justice structure and moral atmosphere of the group. A school moving from a preconventional "do your thing" moral atmosphere to a conventional atmosphere of concern and regulation requires different processes than one moving from conventional community to concern for a community which has a consistent system for maintaining individual rights and individual moral principles in group decisions. In most alternative schools, the assumption has been that staff concern for student rights and participation will generate a Stage 5 constitutional democracy or "social contract" of itself. In our view, a Stage 5 moral atmosphere requires a "conventional" moral atmosphere involving itself in sustained concern for and conflicts between the rights of the individual and the welfare of the group. It also requires, eventually, we believe, a larger unit of government and law than the direct democracy of 30 to 70 members ideal for a community oriented to mutual concern and group welfare.

The major "Stage 5" features of American society have evolved from representative democracy and from the separation of powers and due process procedures of a constitutional legal system. These institutions develop in a large society in which smaller groups and communities (on the order of the Cluster School) have conflicting interests and in which procedural and substantive guarantees of justice are required. The Cluster School is not a constitutional system. Its legal discipline system is not an advocacy system with guarantees that the innocent will never be declared guilty. Its government has no separation of powers and no protections against factions or parties developing around common group economic or power interests. It has no "Bill of Rights" and no Supreme Court to interpret those rights. If the Cambridge High School ever became an organization of "charter communities," hopefully such a larger constitutional representative government would be developed. At present, however, the Cluster community represents neither principled "conscience" nor the constitutional just society but a transitional community for adolescent development.

From the standpoint of moral development theory, we have explained why the Lewin and Durkheim theories are way stations to conventional morality on the road to a morality of principles of justice and a just constitutional society. We need now to indicate why a democratic school is, from the point of view of our theory, better even for the Durkheim goal of attainment of conventional morality.

15. Moral atmosphere and program ideology

Moral or social atmosphere or climate may be related to: (1) dimensions of internal structure of power, justice or communication; (2) by group task or goal; (3) by group development phase; and (4) by group ideology.

1. Dimensions of internal structure

a) Power type: The Lippett and White study of authoritarian, democratic, and laissez faire groups is an example of internal structure type on the power dimension or distribution of social influence.

b) Communication: The Banelas and Bernard work is an example of studies done on internal variation of dimensions of communication.

c) Our own approach centers also on type differences in the justice dimension, i.e., on the distribution of rewards, punishments and goods or benefits in the group. However, Blau and others also focus on distributions of values closely related to justice studies in the distribution of status or respect, the "classic" preoccupation of the sociology of class and station.

The justice structure of a group or institution refers to the way in which goods, rewards and punishments, and status are distributed in the group and the ways in which goods (positive values) and negative values are exchanged. There are two basic dimensions of the justice structure. The first is the community or cooperation-competition dimension. (In a cooperative structure one member's attainment of rewards is contingent on another's and vice versa. In a competitive structure one member's attainment of rewards is a zero-sum game with regard to the others.) The second dimension is that of the fairness of the reward system, i.e., the extent to which rewards or values are exchanged on a basis of equality between members and by the "blindness" of reward distribution.

For various reasons, "cooperative" structures go with democracy; competitive ones with autocracy. In an authoritarian system, all members are competing for rewards from an authority, in a democratic system they are exchanging rewards with each other.

2. Group Tasks

Other major differences in climate arise from group tasks, e.g., (a) intellectual problem solving, (b) psychotherapy and sensitivity training, and (c) education.

3. Developmental Stage

Tuchman (1965) and Tucker (1973) review studies suggesting that the pattern of interaction of a non-structured group goes

through developmental phases which parallel to ontogenic stages of ego-development. Ego development has been defined (Grant, Sullivan, and Grant; Loevinger; Harvey, Hunt, and Schroeder) as going through the following stages:

1) Dependency on authority and black-white thinking responses (Stage 1);
2) Negativism and "defensive" independence and egoism (Stage 2);
3) Conformism and affiliation with another individual or the group (Stage 3);
4) Conscientiousness and interdependence; internal concern for rules, values, achievement (Stage 4);
5) Mutuality and interdependence (Stage 5).

Considering "group task," the moral development program in corrections is generally similar to "therapeutic community" programs in that it task type is loosely "therapy," i.e., it is designed to stimulate change in members' attitudes and self-awareness through social interaction. (Like therapeutic communities, the moral development program ideal-group structure type is cooperative or communitarian and democratic rather than authoritarian.)

The three basic types of educational ideology are: (a) The romantic-maturationist; (b) the cultural-transmission environmentalist; and (c) the cognitive-developmental or interactional. As an example, Carl Rogers' client-centered approach represents

a consistent "romantic" approach. (A. S. Neill's Summerhill, an inconsistent one.) Skinner's behavior-modification approach is a cultural-transmission ideology. The Dewey-Kohlberg democratic ideology is a developmental-interactional one.

Ideologies are defined by: (a) The basic goals of change; (b) the basic means of change; and (c) the basic view of human nature involved.

a) Goals - For the cultural-transmission ideology, change goals are conformity to the culture and the institution. For the romantic, change goals are liberty to be oneself or to grow or to have one's own values. For the interactionist, change goals are attainment of universal rational principles of truth and ethics (represented as a "higher stage").

b) Means of change - For the cultural-transmission ideology the means of change is teaching through modeling, didactic lecturing, reward and punishment. For the romantic-maturationalist, the means are providing opportunities for self-expression and self-understanding, exploring and providing security and acceptance. For the interactionist, means are the provision of social conflict, dialogue, and decision.

In the Dewey-Kohlberg program, morality or justice (principles) is an explicit (a) aim of change and (b) means of change.

Resocilization and psychotherapy models believe moral values to be relative. They teach values and apply praise and blame to behavior, but they apply praise and blame relative to "better mental health," "self-understanding," and "reality," not through application of justice principles. In psychotherapy groups there is a building of trust, sharing, cooperation, affection, as there is in moral develcpment programs, but it is as a instrumental means to a "selfish" end (the self's adjustment) and not because trust and sharing are moral goals in themselves. Development and the use of moral judgments, judgments of ought, praise, and blame by the leader and group members, then, are means in resocialization and therapy programs; in moral development programs they are an end.

There is a second and more important way in which the moral focus of the moral development ideology shapes social climate. Social climate is, in the Just Community, an end in itself, not merely an instrument of therapy or education. The aim of a moral development program is not only to make the individual more fair or moral, but to make the total social structure involved in the program more fair or moral. It focuses directly, then, upon the fairness of administrative, staff and peer cultures as collective entities. A just community is not only a means to moral development in the individual inmate, but an end in itself. This means that a group structure of democracy,

cooperation and community, and fairness are ends in themselves as well as the indispensable means to the goal of individual moral change.

There is a long history of sociological analysis which indicates that individual education and treatment programs accommodate to the bureaucratic structure and functions of institutions. The central focus of individual treatment or education ideologies is upon staff as individuals teaching, disciplining and therapying climate as individuals within a bureaucratic structure.

In contrast, for moral development corrections "justice in treatment" or "justice in education." Accordingly, the ideology expects the staff to be moral, fair, democratic and cooperative in all social relations as "part of their job," not as humanitarian or the of treatment or education "work."

This "strain toward consistency" is part of the ideology. So also is the moral development conviction that the theory or ideology should be shared and criticized openly by the community. Group discussions of moral development theory are held on an infrequent but regular basis. Sharing of the ideology with the inmates can be done without (apparent) indoctrination and didacticism because its core concepts of purpose, justice and development are already familiar to the inmates. This is true also of means; democracy and moral discussion make sense to layment without "buying" a social science theory.

Why the emphasis on democracy in the just community group? Because it is an evolving or self-activating group--it moves toward a higher stage by itself and because it leads to greater moral self-consistency of a "B" substage.

a) Democracy promotes independence of the individual's pursuit of moral goals and norms in positive in dependence of the group and its authority. A moral orientation is more likely to be carried outside the group if the group is democratic. This is the complaint about authoritarian Stage 3 groups like Daytop, that norm-conformity is contingent on continued direct dependency on the group.

b) The moral content of an authoritarian group is moral only to the ingroup. It is particularistic. Demanding loyalty, conformity and attention to the group, it does not demand a moral orientation to the outside group. A democratic group is more universalistic.

[This page might be out of order.]

Chapter 29 - 61

Our analysis of the theories of Durkheim and Lewin tells us that a "good" cohesive or moral group need not be democratic. An authoritarian group can be cohesive and have respect for rules.

While in America democratic groups typically give more responsibility for decision making and rule maintaining to peers than authoritarian groups, Russian and Chinese authoritarian groups give much responsibility too. In a "good" authoritarian group, the choice is heavily influenced by the authority or leader, but he does not coerce group choice. The process of norm-formation and maintenance is a share collective participatory process. A good authoritarian group makes genuine shared or group decisions, it is just that equality of influence of leader and member is not expected. The "good" authoritarian group works through an authority's influence until it gets consent. Even in an authoritarian participatory group, the leader sometimes gives in to the majority if he cannot sway it.

At present, the Cluster School is somewhere between the Russian-Israeli and the "ideal democratic" school. What the students want is a democratic authority, i.e., an authority who gives the student a voice and considers his wishes more than wanting genuine equality. At some points the staff is too complacent about this and too ready to direct decisions; at other points they may have been too non-directive.

III. THE STRUCTURE OF THE JUST COMMUNITY SCHOOL

In the previous section we outlined the theory behind the just community school. In this section we outline the practical day-to-day progress, structure and procedures used to implement the theory. We discuss the current structure, the reasons for this structure, and the basic points to keep in mind in leadership.

1. Relation to school administrators and the total High School

The school administration must be willing to grant the alternative school the necessary autonomy to function as somewhat of a separate entity from the larger school. Aside from the limits of core total school rules, the small community school should be responsible for handling misbehavior that occurs during the time school is in session. The group must feel that they are given credibility to effectively handle problems which arise in their community. This means the school should establish guidelines with other people in the school who traditionally handle disciplinary matters (i.e., deans, headmasters, etc.). An example incident occurred when J. stole some lunch tickets and was selling them to members of the Cluster School. The headmaster of the larger high school wanted to handle this matter in the traditional "private" manner of suspension. One of the staff members went to the headmaster and presented his

ideas as to why this was an important educative experience for the community. The headmaster was most cooperative in turning the matter over to the group with the only restriction being that he wanted a report about the decision from the community. This necessity for the group to establish credibility with others in positions of responsibility served as an asset in that the group worked very hard in considering the issues of this case. They were quite proud when the headmaster commended them on their decision.

The school administrators must be willing to help delineate areas in which the community has the authority and the responsibility for developing rules or policies. State laws and basic broad school rules cannot be voted out by the small just community school, but often enforcement and specific definition of these rules can be handled by the community democratically. An example was the establishment of a Cluster School policy on drugs in school. While the Cluster community could not decide to use drugs during school, they were free to decide on the sanctions to be imposed on drug offenders and the rule definition.

In this example, the community agreed to follow the larger school rules and discipline on drugs until such time that they are able to arrive at a more acceptable rule and discipline procedure. The pressure on the school for making a policy partly

arose when a student was caught dealing pot by the headmaster. The threat of having the headmaster decide on a punishment for R., who had violated the drug rule, helped to unite an obviously divided community on establishing a discipline policy on drugs.

The process of establishing the administrator's trust in the school's ability to make autonomous decisions is somewhat gradual. One incident which demonstrated this process was in the case of a fire alarm being pulled. The setting off of the fire alarm has become quite a common phenomena; consequently, the headmaster felt that he had to take serious steps to curtail this behavior. Shortly after the fire alarm had been pulled, he announced over the public address system that all afternoon classes would be extended ten minutes because the alarm had been pulled. The Cluster School students felt that this was an arbitrary and unfair punishment which they did not want to accept. After some discussion of the issues involved, a group of students went to the principal's office to present their position. The principal agreed to consider their arguments and thanked them for presenting them to him. Ten minutes before the calss was normally scheduled to end, he again spoke on the public address system; his message was that he had reconsidered his original punishment and that it indeed was unfair to penalize the whole student body for the act of one individual. This reversal of the decision served as a positive experience for the teachers,

students, and principal. This also served the enhance the students' awareness of the need to think about decisions which are imposed in terms of fairness.

2. The Teachers

The staff should be volunteers who understand the philosophy of the just community approach and are committed to its application and are willing to remain with the school for at least two years. A democratic school requires a greater than usual time commitment on the part of the staff; it requires at least one extra staff meeting per week which is solely concerned with discussing the development of the school from the perspective of the just community and many extra hours of student advising, working on retreats and extra activities.

Teachers must be comfortable in sharing responsibilities with students. They must be willing to be brought before the community or discipline committee to have their actions evaluated by the community. One teacher became involved in an altercation with a student, lost her temper, and attacked him in an unnecessarily insulting manner. The student was quite upset about this and brought her before the discipline committee. Both parties explained their position before the committee. During the course of the teacher's explanation, she expressed regret about what she had done. At that point, the student decided that an apology

was what he had really wanted and was willing to drop the case at this point.

The group of teachers should be equal and rotate authority roles rather than maintaining the usual pyramid structure of a school. A particularly effective means of handling administrative functions has been the rotating chairperson. This person represents the Cluster School in all meetings which require an "administrator" (i.e., meetings with headmaster representatives). No major decisions are made without first consulting the whole staff. The duration of the term of the chairperson has been one month.

There should be some classes or meetings small enough to allow for some small group situations of at least a ratio of one teacher for ten students. Since the teachers also act as advisors to the students, it is also critical that there is a small enough group to allow these relationships to be meaningful ones.

3. The Students

As with the teachers, all of the students who enter the school must do so voluntarily. Diversity by neighborhood, income and ethnic group is essential. The students selected for the program are chosen by random sample procedures by neighborhood

from volunteers. This approach seemed to be the fairest means of selecting people in combining the need for diversity with the need for non-arbitrariness or personality indicators in choosing the volunteers for the school.

Fairness of restricting entrance in terms of individual's personality The only restriction which the Cluster School has established in selecting new members is that they be willing to abide by the social contract which has been established by the community. They are clearly informed that they have the right and the responsibility to lobby to change any of the rules which they feel are unfair or could somehow be improved. The decision not to select by personality or ability to live in a democracy was not a decision easily arrived at. Many of the small advisor groups wanted to develop elaborate interviewing and evaluation procedures for the prospective members. After many hours of discussion of the unfairness of any personality selection system, the community voted to do away with the qualifying interview. As one student put it, "Look at all the weirdos we've got now--things couldn't get much worse." The new applicants were selected in a random fashion, with a ratio of three girls being selected for every boy. This was because the Cluster School had initially recruited more male students than female students; therefore, the community decided to lessen this imbalance.

4. The Consultants' Role

The major format for staff learning to be a moral educator or to guide a democracy is experiential. The consultant(s) serves as a participant-observer at the small group meetings, community meetings and staff meetings. The staff meetings with the consultants serve as a means of clarifying the staff's own position on the moral issues before the community meeting. The staff often experienced some confusion as to what it meant to be a teacher in a democratic classroom. They wavered between the permissive and authoritarian styles of relating to the students. The true role of staff is not as teacher but as committed member of a democratic community. One example in which the consultant (Kohlberg) pointed this out occurred when students and staff were watching the movie "High School." The staff decreed that there would be no smoking in the room; the group did not question this decision, as it was what they were used to from previous experiences with teachers. However, some of the students did begin to smoke in the room. The teachers proceeded to ignore this "violation" as they did many of the petty "violations" in the high school. The consultant pointed out that the decision should first have been made democratically, and if made democratically, should be taken seriously as a sign of commitment to democratic decision making.

The consultants should serve as a source of support for the staff morale and commitment to the program as well as trainers.

5. The Community Meeting

In a participatory democracy, the community meeting is the central form of government; it is here that final agreement is reached as to the policies and rules for the school. The first central issues for discussion at these community meetings evolve from creating a structure; that is, rules which are necessary for the basic functioning of the school such as cutting, disturbance and absence rules. Other issues come from "crisis" situations of individuals. Other come from appeals of punishments decreed by the discipline committee and others from the re-evaluation or revision of the established rules.

The community meeting is not only a means of governing. Its function is to promote the controlled conflict and open exchange of opinions about fairness that are essential to the moral development of the individuals involved. The majority of the central issues that come before the community involve conflicts among people and their competing claims of right and wrong. Thus, in debating issues of policy and procedures which are fair resolutions for problems in the community, the student is forced to offer and examine his moral reasoning about a situation as compared with his fellow students. For instance, in considering

appeals of a particular "crisis" situation or discipline issue, the community is essentially stimulated to take the perspective or position of the individual and the individual of the other members of the group.

To create a meaningful governance structure for the community requires basic procedural guidelines for conducting the meeting. The early community meetings were quite chaotic; they were essentially 50 minutes of random opinions on a variety of topics. Originally, the group had decided upon a chairperson to conduct the meetings, but had not given this person the option of using any rules of order other than recognizing individuals who wished to speak. The basic guidelines which resulted were that the meetings would be called to order by the chairperson (initially the staff served as models for this role, but students quickly assumed the role of chairperson for these meetings).

Central issues and agenda for each weekly community meeting are carefull thought through in advance by staff and some student representatives (this is done in democracy class and the weekly staff-consultant-student meeting). Issues coming before the large community meeting are discussed in the smaller teacher-student classroom groups the day before the meeting. The small group discussions sort out the basic problems or issues, suggest possible solutions for rules to resolve this, and focus on moral

and fairness reasoning in a small group where everyone has time to talk and be heard and present reasons without a rush to decision and vote. A student representative of each classroom group is selected in advance of the community meeting to summarize the class' proposals and thinking to the larger community.

At the community meeting itself, after each representative of the classroom groups has presented their group's position on a particular subject, a general discussion follows which usually involves a comparison and a contrasting of the various proposals. At this time, members of individual small groups are forced to defend their reasoning.

A perennial problem in meetings is when to call for a vote. A premature call to a vote before adequate discussion leads to poor decisions and a lack of moral thought. Overextensive discussion without decisions bores and frustrates most of the students. Therefore it has become important to have straw votes on the major substantive issues. In this way, it becomes clear whether there is substantial agreement and further discussion is not necessary or whether the community is still divided. It also allows a tentative decision which the community can discuss and reflect on until the next meeting.

A procedure has been followed in which after a straw vote, members of the minority party speak in order to present their position and to change the majority consensus. This avoids unnecessary repetition and distraction in discussion.

After all members of the community who voted in the minority have been given a chance to speak and all approved amendments have been added to the proposal, a real vote is taken. A real vote is one in which the proposal, if it passes, would then become a policy or rule for the community.

There was an initial tendency of staff to deal with controversial issues of fairness indirectly in terms of procedure. For many students, debates about "procedure" in making a decision often seems "Mickey Mouse" in coming to a decision on the basic issue. Procedural concerns, therefore, should protect the rights of the minority to be heard and prevent excess emotion, but procedures should be kept simple, clear and direct. In the development of the community, students have slowly come to develop their own sense of procedure, a sense often as effective as the staff's.

Agreed upon rules can be left somewhat vague until real cases come up. A small participatory community of adolescents functions largely by "common law" or case law and precedent rather than by nailed-down rules that take into account every hypothetical possibility. Early staff efforts in rule discussions to specify every hypothetical eventuality prevented reaching substantive decisions on basic rules. For this and other reasons, vagueness or inequities in the rules not noted by students are sometimes "let be" by staff until individual cases come before

the discipline committee. Individuals are free to, and encouraged to appeal their case to the community meeting for rule modification or questioning of disciplinary decision and for possible rule revision.

6. Small Groups

The small groups are in some respects a smaller-scale community meeting. They precede the community meetings so that the issues and arguments around a specific problem that is facing the community can be clarified. It is difficult to conduct discussions of moral reasoning with a group that is much larger than ten.

Not only do the small groups allow fro greater opportunities for moral development, through more personal involvement in moral discussions and for increased opportunities for role taking, but they are essential for the creation of a viable governance structure and for an increased sense of community. These small groups force the student, through moral discussions with other participants, to reflect on the implications and, therefore, the importance of their decisions, so that the eventual decision of the entire community is "wiser." There is, then, within the small groups a discussion during which many ideas and suggestions are generated and higher-stage students often point out weaknesses in reasoning.

An example of this process occurred last November when one of the students who had not been attending school regularly came to a small group meeting where the topic for discussion was basence or "hooking" school. Most of the group basically believed that the school needed to have a rule on hooking and quickly set about to discuss what might be the fairest rule they could create. This particular student, J., was amazed that no one was objecting to the idea of creating a rule. He finally said, "You are crazy to make a rule which is going to screw yourselves; now you won't be able to hook when you want to." The participants in the group who were largely more committed to the school immediately began to present Stage 3 reasons for the rule and expressed the sense of commitment and responsibility for the school which they felt and wanted him to affirm.

After the discussions have come to some consensus, a proposal is made and a straw vote is taken to determine the sense of the group.

The small group does not specifically focus on personal problems of the students, which are dealt with in the advisor groups that also give experience in client-centered peer counseling.

7. The Advisor Groups

All students have a faculty advisor. Teachers, as advisors, take over most guidance and counselling functions with supervision from a counselor. Counselling and advising go on in a democratic small group called the advisor group.

The function of the advisor group is that of a support group where students can discuss problems of a personal or academic nature and be understood and clarify solutions by the individual and the staff. As an example, one student spoke of feeling hurt about what she perceived to be unfair, unequal treatment at home. The group helped her sharpen her perceptions of the conflict, gave her their ideas on how they perceived the situation and offered her advice on how she might best present her feelings to her parents.

As another example, a student raised situations in which he felt he had been treated unfairly by other teachers, both Cluster and non-Cluster faculty members. One such discussion in the advisor group led to the student brining his Cluster School teacher before the discipline committee. This has also been a format in which students can raise their grievances that are not issues for the discipline committee with other students.

Experimentation is being done with peer counselling in advisory groups. In peer counselling staff teaches students how to listen to and counsel each other, students switching

roles in being counselor and counselee. The basic role of counselor taught and modeled by staff is that of reflective, non-judgmental listening such as that done in Rogers' non-directive or client-centered therapy. Avoiding psychiatric concepts, this form of counselling is compatible with normal friendship and member of community roles. Learning to listen to and take the role of the counselor is a valuable stimulus to moral and social development in the student learning to counsel. In addition to being helpful to the counselled student, this experience creates a sense of openness, trust and closeness in the advisory group and thus to the community.

8. The Discipline Committee

The discipline committee is designed to be a representative group of the Cluster community. Student members are randomly drawn from each of the seven advisor groups where each member must report back about the progress and problems facing the committee that week. In addition, three alternate members are randomly selected from the community at large; these members attend all committee meetings as active and verbal observers and on a rotating basis replace absent voting committee members. The Cluster School staff is represented by one randomly selected staff person who is a full voting member.

The ten student to two staff person ratio roughly approximates the proportion of students to staff in the Cluster population. It is also the maximum feasible size for a group which must rely heavily upon prolonged discussions and questioning to accomplish its tasks. The term of office for all committee members lasts eight to ten weeks, at which time an entirely new voting membership is selected. This rotation is designed to ensure that all community members are given the opportunity to exercise their judgments about the variety of important community issues that come before the committee.